

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 22-23 and 34-39 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 19, 21, 27, and 29 have been amended. Therefore, claims 19-21 and 24-33 are pending.

### Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action states that the follow features in the claims are not shown in the drawings: providing power to a load from at least one of a first power source or a second power source and providing additional power to the load from the second power source based at least in part on the availability of the second power source. Applicants traverse. Fig. 2 shows providing power to a load 200 from at least one of a first power source 210 or a second power source 220. The signal 222 indicates whether the second power source 220 is present and the signal 224 indicates the status of the second power source 220. Additional power may be provided to the load 200 from the second power source 220 based at least in part on the availability of the second power source 220 indicated by the signals 222 and/or 224. Therefore, the drawings show these features recited in the claims. The Office Action also states that the drawings do not show a processor module and a motherboard. These features have been cancelled from the claims. Therefore, the objections to these features are moot. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that the features in the claims as amended are shown in the drawings and respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19-20 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,598,089 issued to Shintomi. Claims 19 and 29 have been amended.

Claim 19, as amended, recites the following:

a primary voltage regulator to provide primary power to a load from at least one of a first power source or a second power source, the primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators; and  
a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load from the second power source based at least in part on availability of the second power source.

Claim 29, as amended, recites similar limitations.

Shintomi discloses a charging apparatus in which a controller controls the charging and discharging of a secondary battery. The controller makes a changeover of a power source so that a DC power source is used as the power source for the controller when the DC power source is present and a secondary battery is used as the power source when the DC power source is not present. Shintomi does not disclose a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load. Furthermore, Shintomi does not disclose a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. These limitations are recited in claims 19 and 29, as amended. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 19 and 29, as amended, are not anticipated by Shintomi.

Claim 20 is a dependent claim and distinguishes for at least the same reasons as its independent base claim 19 in addition to adding further limitations of its own. Therefore, Applicants submit that Shintomi does not anticipate claim 20 for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 19-20 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,327,298 issued to Burgin.

As discussed above, claims 19-20 and 29 recite a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. Burgin discloses a battery backup system for a microcomputer. Burgin does not disclose a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the

load and to control any additional voltage regulators. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 19-20 and 29 are not anticipated by Burgin.

Claims 19 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,493,155 issued to Okamoto et al.

As discussed above, claims 19 and 29, as amended, recite a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. Okamoto discloses an electric power supply system with an air conditioner as a load, a solar photovoltaic cell for supply power to the air conditioner, and a commercial power source for supplying additional power when insufficient. Okamoto does not disclose a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 19 and 29, as amended, are not anticipated by Okamoto.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-22, 24, 27, 30, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,521,150 issued to Bates.

As discussed above, Shintomi does not disclose a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load, as recited in claims 19 and 29. Bates discloses a series of voltage regulators connected in parallel to carry a fractional part of a given load current. When an additional voltage regulator in the Bates system is turned on, the total load current is distributed among the operative voltage regulators. Bates does not disclose a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load. These limitations are recited in claims 19 and 29. Therefore, Bates does not cure the deficiencies of Shintomi. Claims 21-22,

24, 27, 30, and 33 are dependent claims and therefore include all the limitations of their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 21-22, 24, 27, 30, and 33 are patentable over Shintomi and Bates for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 23 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,929 issued to Tanikawa. Claims 23 and 34-36 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot.

Claims 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi in view of Bates and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,109 issued to Yanagisawa.

As discussed above, neither Shintomi nor Bates discloses a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load and a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. These limitations are recited in claims 19 and 29. Claims 25 and 31 are dependent claims and therefore include all the limitations of their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own.

The Office Action states that Yanagisawa discloses a mobile computer, a docking station, and a detachable voltage regulator. Whether or not Yanagisawa discloses these features, Yanagisawa does not disclose a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load and a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. Therefore, Yanagisawa does not cure the deficiencies of Shintomi and Bates. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 25 and 31 are patentable over Yanagisawa, Bates, and Shintomi for at least the reasons stated above.

Claims 26, 32 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi in view of Bates and Yanagisawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,191,943 issued to Tracy. Claim 38 has been cancelled.

As discussed above, Shintomi, Bates, and Yanagisawa do not disclose a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load and a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. These limitations are recited in claims 19 and 29. Claims 26 and 32 are dependent claims and therefore include all the limitations of their independent base claim in addition to adding further limitations of their own.

The Office Action states that Tracy discloses heat dissipation for a docked notebook. Whether or not Tracy discloses heat dissipation, Tracy does not disclose a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load and a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. Therefore, Tracy does not cure the deficiencies of Shintomi, Bates, and Yanagisawa. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 26 and 32 are patentable over Tracy, Yanagisawa, Bates, and Shintomi for at least the reasons stated above.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi in view of Bates and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,630,148 issued to Norris.

As discussed above, neither Shintomi nor Bates discloses a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load and a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. These limitations are recited in claim 19. Claim 28 is a dependent claim and therefore includes all the limitations of its independent base claim 19 in addition to adding further limitations of its own.

The Office Action states that Norris discloses a low, medium, and high performance mode. Whether or not Norris discloses these features, Norris does not disclose a secondary voltage regulator to selectively provide additional power to the load and a primary voltage regulator having a feedback circuit to detect power supplied to the load and to control any additional voltage regulators. Therefore, Norris does not cure the deficiencies of Shintomi and Bates. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 28 is patentable over Norris, Bates, and Shintomi for at least the reasons stated above.

Claims 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shintomi in view of Bates and Tanikawa and further in view of Yanagisawa. Claims 37 and 39 have been cancelled. Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot.


### Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, Applicants submit that claims 19-21 and 24-33 are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: 7/13/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Tom  
Reg. No. 52,291

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(206) 292-8600